

9. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Consideration of the views and information provided by interested persons promotes open communication and enables better decision-making. Agencies, organizations, and members of the public with a potential interest in the proposed action were urged to participate in the decision-making process. Public involvement and agency coordination were integrated into each stage of project development. Consultation and coordination are ongoing.

Public participation and agency coordination is used in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process to collect project information from private citizens, public interest groups, and government agencies to improve the quality of the environmental decision-making as part of the project (Canter 1996). The Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations [Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Chapter V, Part 1506.6] and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Regulatory Program regulations for the implementation of NEPA (33 CFR 325 Appendix B) stipulate the incorporation of public participation into multiple phases of the environmental impact statement (EIS) process, including project scoping and the review of the recommended plan in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Components of the public involvement program, as defined in 40 CFR, at a minimum include:

- Making diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing NEPA procedures;
- Providing public notice of hearings, public meetings, and the availability of environmental documents;
- Holding or sponsoring public hearings or public meetings whenever appropriate;
- Soliciting appropriate information from the public;
- Explaining where interested persons can obtain information, including status reports and other elements of the NEPA process; and
- Providing NEPA documents to the public as stated in the Freedom of Information Act.

The stages of the Masonville Dredged Material Containment Facility (DMCF) project development are: 1) site screening and evaluation 2) additional studies to define existing conditions, 3) presentation of project to the Joint Evaluation Committee (JE), 4) public scoping meetings, 5) alternatives comparison and mitigation identification, 6) recommended plan development, 7) impact evaluation and DEIS preparation, 8) joint permit application, 9) Public hearings and responding to comments on the DEIS, and 10) preparing the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), and 11) completing the Record of Decision (ROD).

Public and agency coordination throughout the proposed Masonville DMCF project are discussed in more detail in the following sections. All agency correspondence received to date is included in Appendix O and all public coordination activities are included in Appendix P.

9.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS

9.1.1 General Groups

The public involved in the proposed Masonville DMCF study included a diverse group of organizations and individuals, ranging from large government agencies to local citizens living in the vicinity of the proposed DMCF. Participants varied in their degree and type of involvement with the project, as well as differences in their backgrounds and perspectives. Participants belonged to five identifiable groups: agency representatives, local government, defined groups, educational institutions, and private citizens. Identification of these five groups allowed public meeting content to be targeted to a specific audience and ensured proper coordination and communication between the Maryland Port Administration (MPA), USACE – Baltimore District, and the public.

9.1.1.1 Agency Representatives

Agency representatives have been involved with Harbor placement site identification and screening and are expected to maintain an active role throughout the life of the project. This group was included in an ongoing collaborative process with the project team. Representatives from Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR), MPA, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration – National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA-NMFS), Maryland Environmental Service (MES), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Maryland Geological Survey (MGS), Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE), U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) were consulted during this process.

9.1.1.2 Local Government

This group includes representatives from Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and Anne Arundel County.

9.1.1.3 Defined Groups

Defined groups were actively involved in the public involvement program. This group was primarily comprised of representatives from the Harbor Team, Citizens' Advisory Committee, Bay Enhancement Working Group (BEWG), charter boat captains, and Maryland Saltwater Sportfishermen's Association.

9.1.1.4 Educational Institutions

Educational institutions are universities conducting research on the project. The University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science has been involved with the proposed Masonville DMCF project.

9.1.1.5 Private Citizens

Private citizens followed the study progress by attending public meetings, were kept informed about the project status, and provided comments when necessary. This group was comprised of local residents from Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and Anne Arundel County.

9.1.2 Involved Project Groups

Several groups have been involved with the proposed Masonville DMCF study since the project initiation, mainly the Dredged Material Management Program (DMMP) groups and the Harbor Team (discussed in detail in Section 9.2). The goals, responsibilities and team members of the DMMP are discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs.

The State DMMP is a comprehensive process used to establish long-term dredging placement plans and identify potential new placement sites. The State of Maryland DMMP relies on input from a variety of stakeholders including citizens and environmental groups, and State and Federal agencies. Stakeholders are organized into three committees – the Executive Committee, the Management Committee, and the Citizens’ Advisory Committee – and are supported by several technical working groups, including the BEWG and the Harbor Team, that are tasked with identifying, studying, reviewing, and prioritizing potential dredged material placement sites.

The State of Maryland’s DMMP is an on-going process that continuously reevaluates dredging options in response to changes in the short- and long-term dredging requirements. Over 100 individuals are included in the committee structure. The purpose of the State DMMP is to establish long-term dredging placement plans and to identify potential new sites. Every proposed placement option must proceed through a series of in-depth conceptual, pre-feasibility and State feasibility-level studies, which examine a wide range of characteristics that include environmental conditions, coastal engineering, dredging engineering, geotechnical engineering, and social effects.

The Citizens’ Advisory Committee regularly holds meetings at the MPA in Baltimore, MD. This Committee met on the following dates and discussed either Harbor options or Masonville:

• May 16, 2001	129	• February 11, 2004
• September 5, 2001	130	• April 14, 2004
• January 9, 2002	131	• June 9, 2004
• May 8, 2002	132	• August 11, 2004
• July 10, 2002	133	• December 2, 2004
• September 25, 2002	134	• January 12, 2005
• November 13, 2002	135	• March 9, 2005
• February 12, 2003	136	• May 11, 2005
• August 13, 2003	137	• July 13, 2005
• October 8, 2003	138	• November 22, 2005
• December 10, 2003		

The Management Committee meets quarterly and holds meetings at the World Trade Center in Baltimore, MD; the Association of Maryland Pilots in Baltimore, MD; and at the MPA Harbor

142 Development Offices in Baltimore, MD. This committee met on the following dates and
143 discussed either Harbor options or Masonville:

144	• January 10, 2001	156	• February 26, 2003
145	• March 27, 2001	157	• May 14, 2003
146	• May 9, 2001	158	• November 5, 2003
147	• September 19, 2001	159	• May 20, 2004
148	• September 29, 2001	160	• December 2, 2004
149	• November 28, 2001	161	• February 27, 2004
150	• January 16, 2002	162	• May 20, 2004
151	• May 8, 2002	163	• February 16, 2005
152	• May 22, 2002	164	• May 18, 2005
153	• September 18, 2002	165	• September 9, 2005
154	• November 8, 2002	166	• November 22, 2005
155	• November 20, 2002		

167
168 The BEWG regularly holds monthly meetings at the MPA Harbor Development Offices in
169 Baltimore, MD; the MES headquarters in Millersville, MD; the USACE - Baltimore District in
170 Baltimore, MD; and at the USFWS Chesapeake Bay Field Office in Annapolis, MD. The
171 BEWG met on the following dates and discussed either Harbor options or Masonville:

172	• March 18, 2002	190	• November 4, 2003
173	• April 1, 2002	191	• January 6, 2004
174	• April 3, 2002	192	• March 2, 2004
175	• April 22, 2002	193	• March 16, 2004
176	• June 17, 2002	194	• April 6, 2004
177	• July 25, 2002	195	• May 4, 2004
178	• August 21, 2002	196	• June 8, 2004
179	• October 3, 2002	197	• July 6, 2004
180	• January 28, 2003	198	• September 7, 2004
181	• February 13, 2003	199	• November 9, 2004
182	• March 5, 2003	200	• January 4, 2005
183	• May 5, 2003	201	• February 8, 2005
184	• July 1, 2003	202	• March 8, 2005
185	• July 23, 2003	203	• April 5, 2005
186	• August 5, 2003	204	• June 7, 2005
187	• August 19, 2003	205	• August 2, 2005
188	• September 9, 2003	206	• September 6, 2005
189	• October 7, 2003		

207
208 The Executive Committee meets as needed, but at least semiannually [Code of Maryland
209 Regulations (COMAR) 5-1104.2 (c)], at the World Trade Center and at the USFWS Chesapeake
210 Bay Field Office in Annapolis, MD. Executive Committee Meeting minutes are available from
211 July 26, 2001 to September 22, 2005. Masonville and/or Baltimore Harbor placement options
212 were discussed at the following meetings:

- 213 • December 5, 2002

- September 15, 2003
- September 21, 2004
- December 16, 2004
- September 22, 2005

Meeting minutes from all noted Citizens' Advisory Committee, Management Committee, and BEWG meetings are available at the MPA Safe Passages website (www.mpasafepassage.org).

9.2 COMMUNITY AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

MPA initiated efforts to include community representatives in the planning of the proposed facility along with engineering and environmental studies and planning. EcoLogix Group, an independent consultant versed in these issues, was retained to identify community leaders and assist in establishing a working group that could converse with the adjoining community, represent their desires, and provide consistency with existing land use plans. The resulting working group became known as the Harbor Team. Members of the Harbor Team include:

- Anne Arundel County Government
- Baltimore City Government
- Baltimore County Government
- Baltimore Development Corporation
- Baltimore Harbor Watershed Association
- Bethlehem Steel Corporation
- Brooklyn-Curtis Bay Coalition
- Cox Creek Citizens Committee
- Domino/The American Sugar Refining Company
- Dundalk Renaissance Corporation
- Greater Dundalk Alliance
- Greater Dundalk Community Council
- Living Classrooms Foundation
- Individuals from Marley Neck
- Association of Maryland Pilots
- National Aquarium in Baltimore
- North County Land Trust
- North Point Peninsula Community Council
- Patapsco and Back Rivers Tributary Team
- Rukert Terminals
- Turner Station Community
- W.R. Grace & Co.

253 The Harbor Team has discussed Masonville or Harbor Options leading up to the Masonville
254 project at the following meetings:

- | | | | |
|-----|------------------|-----|----------------------|
| 255 | • March 3, 2003 | 263 | • July 31, 2003 |
| 256 | • March 26, 2003 | 264 | • August 21, 2003 |
| 257 | • April 17, 2003 | 265 | • September 11, 2003 |
| 258 | • May 8, 2003 | 266 | • October 2, 2003 |
| 259 | • May 29, 2003 | 267 | • October 23, 2003 |
| 260 | • June 14, 2003 | 268 | • January 20, 2005 |
| 261 | • July 10, 2003 | 269 | • July 14, 2005 |
| 262 | • July 19, 2003 | 270 | • October 20, 2005 |

271 Meeting minutes are available for Harbor Team meetings from March 3, 2003 to July 14, 2005 at
272 the MPA Safe Passages website (www.mpasafepassage.org).

273 The Brooklyn-Curtis Bay Coalition (BCBC), which is one of the leading citizens' groups in the
274 Masonville area, is represented on the Harbor Team. The Coalition assists in defining the
275 parameters for a placement facility at Masonville that are acceptable and beneficial to the
276 citizens in the surrounding communities. Baltimore City's Planning Department and the
277 Baltimore Development Corporation are also represented on the Harbor Team and are providing
278 valuable input on these issues.

279 Representatives of MPA's Harbor Studies Design Team met with the DMMP groups (Section
280 9.1.2) during Harbor Team meetings and smaller meetings with individual stakeholders to further
281 define the placement site and enhancements. MPA is using these discussions to help determine
282 the placement facility's footprint and for certain other design characteristics that are included in
283 this EIS. Additionally, these discussions are helping MPA identify the scope of the proposed
284 enhancements and assist in finding potential funding sources for the work.

285
286 **9.2.1 Issue Identification and Project Scoping**

287 Because the proposed Masonville DMCF is on an accelerated schedule, it became apparent in
288 late 2004 that MPA might have to move forward for private permitting. Consequently, formal
289 public scoping began well after the initial screening and site selection. The MPA and its
290 contractors met with the State Federal Joint Evaluation Committee in January 2005. In March
291 2005, the USACE – Baltimore District Regulatory Branch established that it would be the lead
292 agency on the permitting efforts and the MPA met with USACE and MDE to establish a
293 timeline. At that time, the following schedule for site permitting was developed:

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| 294 | • Publish Notice of Intent | 26 May 2005 |
| 295 | • Agency Pre-application Meeting | 31 May 2005 |
| 296 | • Conduct Scoping Process | |
| 297 | ○ Public Meeting | 15 June 2005 |
| 298 | ○ Comments Due | 15 July 2005 |
| 299 | • Final EIS for Federal DMMP | December 2005 |
| 300 | • Federal DMMP Record of Decision | Spring 2006 |
| 301 | • Draft EIS (DEIS) | May 2006 |
| 302 | • DEIS/Permit Application | May 2006 |

- USACE/MDE Public Notice May 2006
- USACE/MDE Joint Hearing June 2006
- Public Comment Due July 2006
- Circulate Final EIS August 2006
- File FEIS with USEPA September 2006
- Record of Decision/Permit Decision October 2006

The Notice of Intent (NOI) was published in the Federal register on May 26, 2005 and went out to the USACE agency distribution list as well as the Harbor Team and DMMP distribution lists (Appendix P). The public scoping meeting was conducted at the Harbor Hospital in Baltimore Maryland on 15 June 2005 (Appendix P). This meeting was the result of the publication of the NOI. Notices were sent to interested parties and advertisements were placed in the newspaper. The public comment period closed on 15 July 2005. Comments received during that period are included in Appendix P.

9.2.2 Coordination with the Joint Evaluation Committee

As part of the ongoing scoping and coordination, the MPA has met with the JE formally and informally since January 2005. The initial meetings were to introduce the group to the project and identify study needs. Subsequent meetings have focused on mitigation needs and options for the wetlands impacts of the proposed project. Meeting dates were as follows:

- 26 January 2005
- 31 May 2005
- 31 August 2005
- 25 January 2006
- 10 Feb 2006
- 16 February 2006
- 22 February 2006
- 2 March 2006

In addition, project coordination and mitigation discussions have also occurred at BEWG meetings in summer and fall 2005.

9.2.3 Agency Coordination

Agency comments have been requested on multiple occasions throughout the screening process. Formally, the Notice of Intent was mailed to federal, state, and local agencies and organizations. These organizations are:

9.2.3.1 Federal Agencies and National Organizations

- U.S. Department of Defense
 - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
 - U.S. Army Aberdeen Proving Ground
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security
 - U.S. Coast Guard – Activities Baltimore, Waterways Management
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

- Chesapeake Bay Program
- Community & Ecosystem Protection Branch
- Environmental Assessment and Innovation Division
- U.S. Postal Service
- U.S. Department of Agriculture
 - Natural Resource Conservation Service
- U.S. Department of the Interior
 - U.S. Geological Survey
 - Office of Environmental Policy & Compliance
 - U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
 - Chesapeake Bay Field Office
 - Division of Habitat Evaluation & Protection
 - National Park Service
- U.S. Department of Energy
 - Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
 - Office of Environmental Compliance
- National Aquarium
- U.S. Department of Commerce
 - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
 - National Marine Fisheries Service, Habitat Conservation Division

9.2.3.2 State Agencies and Organizations

- Maryland Department of Natural Resources
 - Fisheries Division
 - Fisheries Service
 - Licensing & Registration Service Division
 - Critical Area Commission for the Chesapeake and Atlantic Coastal Bays
 - Shore Erosion Control Program
 - Fish Management Plan Program
 - Coastal Zone Management Division
 - Cooperative Oxford Laboratory
 - Wildlife and Natural Heritage
 - Chesapeake & Coastal Watershed Services
 - Monitoring & Non-tidal Assessment Division
 - Natural Resources Police
 - Maryland Geological Survey
 - Information Resource Center
 - Boating Administration
- Maryland Department of General Services
- Maryland Port Administration
 - Planning & Environment
 - Harbor Development
- Maryland Department of the Environment
 - Technical & Regulatory Services Administration
 - Tidal Wetlands Division
 - Water Management Administration

- Sediment & Stormwater Plan Review Division
- Dredging Coordination & Assessment Division
- Non-point Source Program
- Maryland Department of Planning
- Maryland State Highway Administration
 - Office of Environmental Design
- Maryland Board of Public Works
- Maryland Department of Agriculture
- Maryland Department of Transportation
- Maryland Environmental Services
- State Water Quality Advisory Committee
- D.C. Environmental Health Administration
 - Water Quality Division
 - Fisheries & Wildlife Division
- Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
- Virginia Port Authority
- Virginia Marine Resources Commission

9.2.3.3 Local Agencies and Organizations

- Anne Arundel County
 - Community & Environmental Health
 - Land Use Office
 - Environmental Commission
 - Department of Planning & Zoning
 - Department of Public Works
- Baltimore County
 - Department of Environmental Protection & Resource Management
- City of Baltimore
 - Department of Planning
- The Harbor Team

Following the public scoping meeting, the USACE – Baltimore District Regulatory Branch was consulted regarding the need for formal resource agency consultations during the DEIS development. The USACE – Baltimore District indicated that because the JE and other resource agencies would be given the opportunity to formally comment on the permit application, only informal consultations would be required to confirm the status of key resources.

The SHPO was consulted and their response is included in Appendix O. Fort McHenry is a historical and cultural resource located within 1 mile of the proposed Masonville site. Coordination with the National Park Service (NPS) and Fort McHenry are ongoing. In addition, USFWS, NMFS, and Maryland DNR (Natural Heritage) were consulted informally on the status of rare, threatened, and endangered (RTE) species for the site. Copies and responses of those letters are included in Appendix O. A Section 7 Consultation was requested by NMFS for shortnose sturgeon and sea turtles and is included in Appendix D.

The Critical Areas Commission for the Chesapeake and Atlantic Coastal Bays was consulted on access to and cleanup of Masonville Cove and members of that agency visited the site in September 2005.

9.2.4 Other Coordination and Agency Responses

Throughout the screening and mitigation development process, informal consultations by MPA have been ongoing with various resource agencies and citizen's groups. These agencies and groups are described in more detail below and include the BCBC, the Maryland DNR, MDE, NMFS, USFWS, Baltimore City Department of Planning, the National Park Service (NPS), Patapsco Riverkeeper, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Community of Curtis Bay Association, Concerned Citizens for a Better Brooklyn, South Baltimore Business Alliance.

9.2.4.1 Brooklyn-Curtis Bay Coalition (BCBC)

MPA and their representatives have had ten formal group meetings with the BCBC since May 2004 to discuss Masonville DMCF and Cove mitigation issues. The BCBC indicated that it wanted mitigation options that provided use of the Cove for bird watching, environmental education and passive recreation. The BCBC also requested enhancement of existing wetlands and other habitat areas, wetland and beach creation, and debris removal. As a result of these meetings, several of the pre-feasibility alignments were eliminated and additional feasibility-level alignments were proposed. Several requests were submitted to the MPA for consideration on its list of mitigation projects.

Other coordination by MPA and their representatives included frequent emails, telephone calls and meetings with the BCBC's leadership and staff beginning in March 2004. During these numerous contacts, the projects identified above were discussed in greater detail to ensure that community visions and goals were conveyed to MPA for consideration and that all community questions were answered.

9.2.4.2 Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR)

MPA and their representatives have had two meetings with the Maryland DNR since June 1, 2005 to discuss fish and eel stocking options as mitigation projects for Masonville. The Maryland DNR indicated that stocking shad and herring and/or American eels in the Patapsco River could provide significant benefits to Patapsco River populations. As a result of the meetings and numerous telephone conversations and emails, the Maryland DNR submitted proposals for a shad and herring stocking project and for an American eel stocking project to be considered for the Masonville mitigation package.

Other coordination included a letter from the Wildlife and Heritage Service that "determined that there are no State or Federal records for rare, threatened or endangered species within the boundaries of the project site as delineated." No comments or requirements were given in the 14 October 2005 letter. The letter can be found in Appendix O.

9.2.4.3 Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)

MPA and their representatives have had three meetings with the MDE since August 2005 to discuss the remediation of the derelict vessels, demolition of deteriorating piers, and construction of the DMCF (August 23, 2005; August 31, 2005; September 21, 2005). One meeting was held with the MDE to discuss mitigation issues and project schedule mile stones on January 13, 2006. Additional informal meetings are anticipated to exchange information needed by MPA to develop a detailed workplan for these activities. Since October 2005, MDE Water Management staff have been consulted continuously during EIS development and have attended multiple meetings with the Corps and the applicant.

Other coordination included background phone calls beginning in August 2005 with various MDE staff to provide information on the derelict vessels and identify the issues that needed to be resolved. Two informal meetings were held with the MDE Waste Management Administration related to management and disposition of the derelict vessels and the former Kurt Iron and Metal (KIM) site. These occurred on September 8 and September 21, 2005.

9.2.4.4 National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)

Informal consultation with the NMFS by MPA (and their representatives) as well as the USACE resulted in a request for a Section 7(a)(2) consultation for Shortnose Sturgeon, sea turtles, and large listed whales. The letters from NMFS can be found in Appendix O. The USACE - Baltimore District is continuing to coordinate with NMFS and has prepared and sent a biological assessment for the species of concern (Appendix D).

An essential fish habitat (EFH) assessment has also requested by NMFS. It has been completed and sent by the USACE to NMFS for consideration. The EFH assessment is included in Appendix D.

9.2.4.5 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

An informal consultation letter was sent to USFWS September 9, 2005 and a response dated December 8, 2005 was received. The USFWS noted that there were Bald Eagles in the area and that a Section 7 consultation may be required depending on the location of development. Coordination with USFWS is ongoing; the initial USFWS response letter is included in Appendix O. A second coordination letter was prepared and Sent on May 2, 2006.

9.2.4.6 Baltimore City Department of Planning

There were at least four meetings with the Baltimore City Department of Planning to discuss the Masonville DMCF and Cove mitigation projects beginning in May 2004. The Planning Department requested information on the hydrodynamic impacts that would result from construction of the DMCF. During these meetings, the Department also commented on the mitigation projects. The outcome of the meetings was that the City generally supported the Cove mitigation projects and submitted additional projects for consideration.

Other coordination included numerous emails and phone calls to provide further details on the issues listed above.

9.2.4.7 National Park Service (NPS)

There was one meeting in February 2005 with the NPS at Fort McHenry to discuss the Masonville project and its potential impact to the views from Fort McHenry. Park Service staff indicated that the Service was aware of the project and wanted to receive status reports. The Service also offered to assist in any wetland enhancements or creation efforts based on its experience with the Fort McHenry wetlands restoration projects.

Other coordination included phone calls and emails conveying follow up information in October 2005. The USACE - Baltimore district will be officially consulting the NPS regarding the proposed DMCF.

9.2.4.8 Patapsco Riverkeeper

There were three meetings with the Executive Director of the Patapsco Riverkeeper beginning in June 2005 to discuss the Masonville DMCF and Cove mitigation projects. The Riverkeeper indicated interest in the hydrodynamic impact of the proposed Masonville DMCF and general support for the Cove enhancement projects. The Executive Director also indicated that she wanted to receive project status updates.

Other coordination included emails on these issues.

9.2.4.9 Chesapeake Bay Foundation

There were two meetings with the Chesapeake Bay Foundation beginning in April 2005 to discuss the Masonville DMCF, Masonville Cove mitigation projects and other DMMP issues (Appendix P). The Chesapeake Bay Foundation expressed general environmental concerns relating to the Bear Creek sediment contamination and requested status updates on all of the DMMP projects.

Other coordination included emails and phone calls on these issues.

9.2.4.10 Community of Curtis Bay Association

There was one meeting with the Community of Curtis Bay Association in August 2005 to discuss the Harbor Team process, Masonville DMCF and Cove mitigation projects (Appendix P). The Association suggested that there would be security needed if the Cove became a public park and raised the question of potential leaching of contaminants from the DMCF but generally supported the project. Efforts to minimize any potential leaching of contaminants have been integrated into the project (Chapters 5 and 7).

Other coordination included emails and phone calls on these issues.

9.2.4.11 Concerned Citizens for a Better Brooklyn

There was one meeting with the Concerned Citizens for a Better Brooklyn group in August 2005 to discuss the Harbor Team process, Masonville DMCF and Masonville Cove mitigation projects (Appendix P). The Association generally supported the project.

Other coordination included emails and phone calls on these issues.

9.2.4.12 South Baltimore Business Alliance

There was one meeting with the South Baltimore Business Alliance in February 2005 to discuss the Harbor Team process, Masonville DMCF and Masonville Cove mitigation projects (Appendix P).

Other coordination included emails and phone calls on these issues.

9.2.4.13 National Aquarium at Baltimore

There were meetings on January 9, 2006 and March 20, 2006 with the National Aquarium at Baltimore and others to discuss the proposed environmental education programs and facilities as part of the Masonville Cove mitigation package.

9.2.4.14 The Living Classrooms Foundation

There were meetings on January 9, 2006 and March 20, 2006 with the Living Classrooms Foundation at Baltimore and others to discuss the proposed environmental education programs and facilities as part of the Masonville Cove mitigation package.

9.2.4.15 Chesapeake Center for Youth Development

There was a meeting on January 9, 2006 with the Chesapeake Center for Youth Development and others to discuss the proposed environmental education programs and facilities as part of the Masonville Cove mitigation package.

9.2.4.16 Maryland Environmental Trust (MET)

There was a meeting with the MET and the BCBC on January 26, 2006 to discuss the conservation easement requirements, which would be part of the proposed mitigation package.

9.2.4.17 Baltimore Harbor Watershed Association (BHWA)

There was a meeting with the BHWA on February 16, 2006 to present and discuss the proposed Masonville project and mitigation.

9.2.4.18 Maryland Historic Trust (MHT)

The State Historic Preservation Officer was consulted several times in 2004 and 2005 during the initial cultural resource studies conducted for the project (Section 2.2). The USACE also sent a coordination letter to the MHT on May 2, 2006 (Appendix O).

9.3 Preliminary Draft EIS Agency Review

On March 17, 2006, a read ahead version of this draft EIS was provided to NMFS, USFWS, US EPA Region 3, several departments within MDE and MDNR, and Baltimore City Department of Planning. The comments received are included in Appendix O. Responses have been prepared and are also included in the Appendix O. To the extent possible, all comments have been addressed in this version of the DEIS, unless noted in the comment-response table.